No. 167 SEPTEMBER 1982

Spearhead

35p

THE JEWISH RAPE OF LEBANON

An American view (pages 8-10)

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

Rot in the Church

The only thing remarkable about the leftist-liberal format of the Falklands commemoration service in St. Pauls is that it should have caused so much surprise. No sooner was the service over than Tory war horses, headed by the ridiculous Julian Amory, let out a bellow of outraged protest which sounded for all the world as if they had suddenly discovered a new and hitherto unknown truth: that Britain's established churches had become deeply penetrated by clerics of a far left-wing hue and that the church was being used as an instrument of anti-British subversion.

Of course every serious student of British politics is aware that this has been going on for a long time, and that in the light of it there was nothing in the Falklands service that was in the least unexpected. Why then wait till this late moment in the day to protest about it? Those who have been getting themselves in the news with their angry comments should have been sounding the alarm, as we were, a long time ago.

The Conservative Party in particular is in no position to go about now posing as an opponent of 'red' Christianity. Conservative governments were in office in 1951-64 and again in 1970-74 and there is no record of their having done anything in the least effective to combat the creeping Marxist influence among the clergy – which of course they could very easily have done had they had the inclination, first by cutting off the state aid that the churches need to keep financially afloat, secondly by appointing primates to the main churches who could be relied upon to sweep those churches clean of left-wingers, and thirdly by leading government officials and spokesmen speaking out loudly and publicly against the trend.

The service itself was indeed a disgrace and none the less so for its predictability. Of all the comments about it that have followed perhaps the most impressive came from the Dean of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Edward Norman, who, writing in the Sunday Telegraph, said:-

> 'During the last two decades the leaders of the churches have shown enormous sympathy for the use of force to end 'oppression' and 'institutional violence' in the countries of the developing world. In Southern Africa and Central and South America, in the Philippines and South Korea, organised church opinion has been mobilised to assist revolutionary groups seeking the overthrow of society in the interests of 'justice.'
>
> "...Why was it then that when the British Government had to resort to force in the Falklands episode, to dislodge an aggressor who had first used violence on a colossal scale, and whose purpose was the clear denial of the basic rights of the islanders, that the leaders of the churches were among the first to draw back in horror?
>
> "...It must be remembered that those church leaders who all along opposed the Government's Falklands policy did not do so for moral or humanitarian reasons, as they announced, but for political reasons."

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY
Done nothing to stop the rot

The Dean has of course hit the nail right on the head. To contemporary churchmen the use of force, while wrong when employed in a national and patriotic cause, suddenly becomes, by some weird mental acrobatics, right when directed to any purpose favourable to left-wing revolution. This is hypocrisy of the most blatant kind but it has now become standard thinking in most of the churches in Britain and around the Western World.

The Dean also echoed our own views when he said that the anger of so many over the service, while entirely appropriate, had come too late, for almost the whole leadership of the churches now espouses the attitudes the service epitomised.

Re-writing the hymnbook

With the Falklands service fresh in memory, no surprise either should have been caused when the clergy came up with its next piece of left-wing idiocy, the rewriting of the National Anthem so as to delete the 'jingoistic' passages.

SPEARHEAD

No. 167 SEPTEMBER 1982
Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex
Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisations *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

Not that we have ever been unduly enamoured of the National Anthem as it is. The melody is not the most inspiring available, nor is it even of British origin. And the words – particularly such ones as "confound their politics; frustrate their knavish tricks" – could do with a great deal of improvement. Probably Elgar's 'Land of hope and glory" would be a lot more suitable from all points of view, perhaps with some minor modification of the lyrics to take into account the fact that our Anthem belongs, not only to those who inhabit the 'land' of Britain, but all those who share the British heritage.

But none of these good reasons for altering our national song existed in the minds of the group of clerical gentlemen who suggested the recent amendments – oh no! Their objections were to such phrases as "scatter her enemies" – not because they sound a bit corny (which that one does) but because it is offensive to their poor, delicate minds even to suggest that the nation and its Sovereign should have 'enemies'. The alterations generally are defended along similar lines.

The same sick clique has apparently been busy with other hymns. For instance, 'Onward Christian soldiers' must be altered because it is "too militaristic." And 'Eternal Father strong to save' has to be modified because certain passages were reckoned to be evocative of 'imperialism'. Yes, by now dear reader you must be laughing, and so would we if these creatures were likely to be consigned to the padded cells where they belong. But this is not going to happen. Instead they are going to remain a strong influence within our established church and their parodies of the hymnbook, if not universally adopted overnight, are going to be sung in a lot of places, including no doubt many of our schools, where there is no shortage of equally 'trendy' teachers ready and eager to convey the spirit of the new words to their unsuspecting pupils.

This, as we have indicated earlier, is no new development. It is the product of a slow and insidious rot in established religion that has been maturing for decades – decades in which 'Conservatives' apparently have been fast asleep. Now they squeal because its notes jar in their ears. Poor fools! They are now reaping the harvest of their own complacency and apathy.

Harrier in danger

The magnificent Harrier jump-jet, which contributed so greatly to victory in the Falklands, could be in danger if a scheme now being backed by the Government is allowed to go ahead.

The Government agreed last year to join with the Americans in developing a new version of the aircraft, instead of building a purely British successor to the existing one, as originally planned.



THE NEW HARRIER
No longer a British aircraft

The Government has attempted to justify the scheme by the fact that Britain's own requirements for the aircraft were modest compared with those of the Americans – an initial 60 planes for the RAF, while the US Navy planned to supply 336 of them for its marine corps. Under the deal, British industry would have a half-share in building the aircraft, an estimated £2,000 million worth of business.

Now the US Navy is having second thoughts about the project and is pressing the Pentagon for a substantial cutback, with one lobby even calling for its complete abandonment in favour of the American-built F18 fighter for the role in question.

The most likely outcome of the affair is that there will be a big reduction of the number of Harriers ordered by the Americans – a reduction amounting to over 40 per-cent. If the British Government then decides still to go ahead with the project under these terms, as it may very well do, there is the danger that later on the Americans could determine on further reductions or even a scrapping of the scheme. This could endanger the whole future of the Harrier.

We should remember what happened when Harold Wilson's Labour Government in the 1960s decided to scrap the all-British TSR2, the finest fighting aircraft in the world at the time, in favour of the American TFX. The latter was later scrapped by the Americans and we were left high and dry. Some authoritative spokesmen for the air industry claimed that the TSR2 was deliberately murdered for political reasons.

The case is overwhelming for Britain going ahead with a purely British-built new version of the Harrier. Even if the demand for the aircraft from the British forces is small when related to the cost, there is likely to be a massive demand from abroad which will boost exports. The performance of the Harrier in the Falklands made a tremendous impression on the world's defence chiefs and big orders are likely to come from all parts of the globe.

These facts must surely be known to defence planners in Whitehall but it seems that for these gentlemen there is always an irresistible seduction in 'international' projects of the kind favoured, particularly when these involve collaboration with the Americans or Continentals. Are these internationalist schemes favoured as a result of calculations by accountants? Or is their main inspiration political?

Pacifism only for export

The principal argument of Britain's nuclear disarmers is that if this country gives a lead by abandoning nuclear weapons the rest of the world will follow our example and we will have everlasting world peace.

A young man named Sergei Batrovin is in a position to know otherwise.

Batrovin is a member of a small group in Russia that has been campaigning for world nuclear disarmament. Now he is under KGB guard in a psychiatric hospital. Two of his associates are in jail.

You see, as far as Russia is concerned disarmament and pacifism are fine – as long as they do not apply to Russia itself. They are commodities strictly for export, to be promoted by Russia's agents and their dupes throughout the non-Communist world. But the moment that anyone tries to promote them in Russia the regime comes down on them like a ton of bricks.

Perhaps the Russians are right though. Anyone who really believes in the possibility of world nuclear disarmament surely must be a candidate for a place in the nuthouse.

Mrs. Thatcher

THE POLITICIAN BEHIND THE POSES

by JOHN TYNDALL

DURING THE HEIGHT of the Falklands conflict in May one euphoric 'right-wing' newspaper, searching for some hyperbole appropriate to a moment of the most encouraging military success, described Mrs. Thatcher as "the greatest Prime Minister since Churchill."

Coming from another source, such a description might have raised a snigger; considering that Mrs. Thatcher's rivals for such a title are Messrs. Attlee, Eden, Macmillan, Home, Wilson, Heath and Callaghan, many will agree that it is not one that should be invested with too much distinction. This, however, would be to miss the point. The paper concerned was obviously quite serious in its sentiments; it really did intend to portray the present Premier as a political giant and patriot, stoutly defending Britain's interests and standing up to her enemies as no leader has done for many a year. Those of us 'in the know' as to the realities of the national and world situation may indeed laugh aloud at such an idea, but we cannot afford to ignore the fact that it is today shared by a great number of our fellow countrymen and women, including, unfortunately, many of those of the healthiest political instincts who should know better. I have even heard some who belong to nationalist organisations talk of Mrs. Thatcher in terms of considerable admiration. Clearly there is some educating still to do, and I hope here to contribute something to that process.

Perhaps I should come clean with our readers at the outset by admitting that I write with some bias. I do not like Mrs. Thatcher. In fact whenever her face appears on the television screen I feel the itch to run out into the garden and draw a gulp of fresh air. All of us, to be effective in politics, must at times, I suppose, resort to a degree of posture. But watching this lady face the interview cameras is to behold a person to whom posing has become such a habit that no glimpse of any normal, natural personality ever comes through. It is like some second-rate actress practising before the mirrors in her dressing room before she goes on stage. There is always something pathetically comic in a grocer's daughter trying to be an Audrey Fforbes Hamilton, but when Penelope Keith plays the latter part in the TV series one always senses that there is a sincere person laughing at the role through the poses; not so with the empress of the new Toryism, who has so totally integrated herself with the feathered hats and Roedean voices of that world of Conservative garden fetes that she fails to see the gargantuan absurdity of the whole performance.

That performance really reaches its most excruciating when Mrs. Thatcher puts on her 'concerned' and 'compassionate' expression. One gets used to this kind of thing from the worst species of bleeding heart liberals, but Mrs. T obviously wants to outdo even that species in the art of the caring facial gesture. The result is a profile so transparently insincere that one is immediately on one's guard. Anyone who poses like that cannot be trusted, one thinks, and in fact the whole of the Thatcher political record, when examined in terms of realities rather than slogans and *clichés*, bears this out.

THE MASK OFF

An acquaintance of mine once managed to corner the Tory leader at a party function and asked her what she thought of the betrayal of the White Man in Britain and in South Africa. The TV cameras were of course not present and the sickly smile soon disappeared. A dark expression came over the Thatcher face and she snapped that she had not come there to be questioned and then turned quickly and walked off.

This of course was only consistent with the policy that the lady was following, and was to continue to follow, with regard to South Africa – and indeed Rhodesia. She has from the outset supported the dismantlement of White rule in the latter country and its replacement by the Marxist dictatorship of Robert Mugabe. A Black take-over of Rhodesia always was Tory policy, even when certain Tories were attempting to make electoral capital by attacking the more blatantly anti-White actions and pronouncements of the Wilson and Callaghan Labour Governments, but the Tories in earlier days tried to distance themselves from their political opponents by saying that they would only agree to a hand-over to 'moderate Blacks' such as Bishop Muzorewa (as if it made any difference). In the final event, the then Foreign Minister Carrington, acting in 1980 under a clear mandate from his political chief, sanctioned the hand-over of Rhodesia's Whites to a red-hued political thug, whose hands had been soaked with the blood of many an innocent White – and Black – family in the terror campaign that preceded the setting up of the Soviet state of 'Zimbabwe'.

The millions of political zombies who now 'rah rah' their approval of the Government's action to rescue 1,800 of our kith and kin in the Falklands seem to have short memories when it comes to the near quarter of a million of our kith and kin in Rhodesia who were shamelessly sold down the river by that very same Government and that very same Prime Minister. Why the inconsistency of policy? I would suggest it is compounded of two factors: first, that the Argentines who took over the Falklands were White

Contd. on next page

Nationalists and not Black Communists; second, that the very manner of the Falklands take-over by Argentina – a blatant act of armed aggression against a British territory by a foreign power – provoked a gut reaction among Britain's voters which was too strong at the time to ignore. In the very first day or two following the invasion of the Falklands it became clear from the soundings by the Tory public opinion experts that not to act in the Falklands would cost the Government an immense amount of public support, whereas if it did act it could indeed gain much of the support it had lost by its lamentable performance thus far on the domestic front, and accomplish precisely what President Galtieri had sought to accomplish in his country: the diversion from political and economic realities at home by armed adventure abroad.

The decision to send the Task Force to retake the Falklands was one of the very few right decisions that Mrs. Thatcher's Government has made, but before we start applauding this decision and imagining that it indicates any genuinely patriotic intent we should be clear about the motives underlying it, and these should be evident from the record of what happened on the diplomatic front both before the Argentine invasion and immediately following it.

Prior to the invasion, the Foreign Office had been in regular negotiation with Argentina over the future of the Falklands, and it was quite clear from this negotiation that the FO was simply looking for a formula to get rid of the islands without causing too much of a stir among their inhabitants and among public opinion in Britain. Had it been otherwise, as apologists for the FO will claim, it was the clear duty of that department of Government to break off all consultations with the Argentines and inform them curtly that the Falklands were none of their business. This did not happen.

It is equally clear that President Galtieri would not have dared stage his invasion when he did had he not been advised by his own foreign policy experts of the British intention to hand over the islands and that they therefore would not regard them worth defending if they were attacked.

It has now come to light that the Government had clear warning of the invasion some weeks before it took place but did not take any measures to reinforce the tiny garrison there or provide an added naval presence in the area.

We are informed that immediately the Government knew about the invasion but before there had been time to gauge public opinion on the matter it dispatched a small advance Task Force to precede the main force, which would take time to prepare. This is no doubt true, but it does not indicate anything more than a token gesture, which the Prime Minister knew would be necessary to placate opinion in her party and in the country. The question of whether this force was to be used would be decided later according to political considerations, as always.

We know the rest of the story. While our forces were sailing for the South Atlantic, the Government, through its new Foreign Secretary Francis Pym and its Ambassador to the United Nations Sir Anthony Parsons, launched a diplomatic offensive across the world in language which made it clear that it was still prepared to consider Argentine sovereignty over the Falklands as a long-term option provided that Galtieri would get it off the hook of its embarrassment by withdrawing his forces from the islands for the time being. The stink of sell-out still pervaded the air while the posture of resolution was maintained as the main body of the Task Force neared its destination.

As we have said before in this magazine, the apologia that all this was the work of the 'wets' in the Foreign Office and not the fault of Mrs. Thatcher simply will not do. As Prime Minister, she is responsible for national affairs. The FO does not **decide** foreign policy; it merely **advises** the Premier on the policy options that, in its opinion, exist. It is then for the latter to adopt or reject them. Where it is clear that they are incompatible with national interests or honour, their rejection is the obvious course. Has Mrs. Thatcher recognised that the options constantly presented her by her foreign affairs advisers are thus incompatible? In that case by adopting them she has shown herself prepared to trade national interests and honour in the game of politics. Or has she failed to recognise them as thus incompatible? In that case she is simply incompetent.

FRIEND OF THE WETS

If this should still seem a harsh judgement of the 'Iron Lady' in the eyes of her supporters, let us now turn to two other areas of political importance which I combine together because they have become related: Law and Order and Race.

We have grown tired of hearing how, in the law-and-order debate, the Prime Minister stands well to the right of her 'wet' Home Secretary, Willie Whitelaw. The fact remains that, as with that of Foreign Secretary, the office of Home Secretary is one that rests upon the choice of the Prime Minister herself. Mrs. Thatcher could at any time, as a token of her determination to adopt a stronger line against mounting crime, violence and disorder, dismiss this walking disaster of a home affairs minister whose several chins quiver in terror at the mere thought of the death penalty or of businesslike methods of riot control. We have already seen signs that there is a rising tide of frustration within the ranks of the Tory Party at the manifest inadequacies of 'Wobbly Willie' and there are apparently several resolutions submitted for the agenda of this year's party conference to the effect that he should go. Yet Mrs. Thatcher has only recently spoken out strongly in defence of Willie and indicated her intention to keep him in his post. What other facts can we deduce from this than that her 'hard-line' pronouncements on this field of national affairs are like everything else about her – a mere posture?

Into the law-and-order question comes the question of Northern Ireland. Here one might expect from a strong 'right-wing' Tory Prime Minister a policy of uncompromising determination to oppose the threat to Britain's sovereignty over that province with all the means within her power. Yet what have we had from Mrs. Thatcher so far? First she appointed to the Northern Ireland Secretaryship an arch-wet, Humphrey Atkins, and then she succeeded him with an even bigger wet, James Prior. Most of the energies of both Atkins and Prior have been devoted to touting support for a new 'Northern Ireland Assembly', which has obviously been conceived as yet another gesture of appeasement to the Republican lobby in Ulster.

In the meantime Mrs. T has confirmed that appeasement and compromise with Republicans is the order of the day by herself meeting with Eire Premier Haughey to discuss Ulster's future – an action which she knew would be taken as an insult to Loyalists but with which she nevertheless went ahead.

Quite clearly, as long as this policy of appeasement continues, the murderers of the IRA are going to continue to receive the encouragement they need to carry on their campaign of terror.

But it is where the issue of Law and Order touches upon the explosive issue of Race that the true wetness of this present Government and its leader become most apparent. The test came when last year a major riot broke out in Southall which set the pattern for a further series of riots taking place over 40 or 50 towns and cities during the month of July.

The Southall riot was started by a gang of Coloureds, mainly young Asians, who later claimed that they had been 'provoked' by a coachload of White skinheads who came to the area to attend a 'pop' concert. Perhaps some blame does attach to the skinheads, who would have been better advised not to waste their time shouting abuse at the Coloureds but to oppose the latter's presence in this country by the appropriate political action. Nevertheless, the fact remains that **they** did not engage in a massed physical attack on anyone nor set fire to buildings resulting in damage worth hundreds of thousands of pounds; those actions were the work of the Coloured gangs, and they – not the skinheads – should have taken the brunt of national condemnation.

But this was not the way that Margaret Thatcher saw it. No sooner had the fires of the riot died out than she was up on her platform slanging the 'racism' and 'fascism' of the young Whites and saying scarcely a word about the rampage of destruction for which the Coloured element was responsible.

Mrs. Thatcher then acted true to form

Contd. overleaf

MRS. THATCHER
(Contd. from prev. page)

when riots later broke out in Toxteth, Liverpool, among the many other areas. There she dispatched another king-wet among the many who seem to abound in her Cabinet, Michael Heseltine, whose mission it was to buy the rioters off with a massive programme of state aid which, by supplying all the goodies which they demanded as they took to the streets, would supposedly remove the causes of their rioting.

All this is of course pure liberal do-gooder abracadabra. The theory that bad social, educational and economic conditions are the cause of Black rioting and that the latter can be eliminated by the state playing Father Christmas to the Blacks and heaping every social, economic and educational benefit on them, regardless of whether they earn these benefits or not – such a theory has long been discredited in the American experience, particularly in the St. Louis (Missouri) housing project, where filthy Black tenements were torn down and brand new apartments given their occupants at enormous public expense – only to result a few years later in the new apartments being reduced to the same condition as the previous tenements and Black violence continuing unabated. All these facts of life are of course known to government ministers in this country, as are the wealth of similar facts drawn from our now considerable British experience of the same problem. Yet this Government, as with every previous government, prefers to ignore the facts and persist with the same outworn social superstitions concerning the depressed condition of Black people.

VOTE-CATCHING PLOY

Mrs. Thatcher, with an eye very much on the General Election that came in May 1979, once said in a TV interview that the British people were afraid of being 'swamped' by the Coloured newcomers to this country. From the left-liberal establishment this brought forth cries of horror and reprobation, while from the mass of ordinary British people it brought forth millions of votes. It was of course a cleverly conceived political statement, for it committed the future Prime Minister to nothing. And in fact she has done nothing. She has merely acquiesced in the very process of 'swamping' about which she was sounding warnings when on the way to office. Very little has been done to stem the flow of Coloured immigrants into this country and what has been done can be taken to be mere cosmetics. Nothing has been done to organise repatriation of those immigrants already here, nor has anything been done to dismantle the infamous 'race relations' industry that battens on the problems that government have created and tyrannises the British people who object to it.

MUGABE AT No. 10
The gangster and butcher welcomed by Thatcher on his visit to London

In the field of race in Britain, as with Rhodesia, a parallel might be drawn with the fate of those kith and kin down in the Falklands who for a short time were subject to brutalities of an alien occupation. Just as no 'task force' was ever sent to Africa to defend our White subjects there, nor has any resolute defence been offered of the White Britons who live in daily terror of mugging, rape and arson in the once British neighbourhoods of Brixton, Toxteth, Moss Side and Handsworth. Yet as with the Rhodesians these are vastly greater in number than the Falklanders and the presence they have to endure infinitely more foreign. Why do they not have the same right to the Queen's protection and the Queen's peace?

One of the popular fables of Tory Party gossip is that Mrs. Thatcher is not over-enamoured with the European Common Market, and this has nurtured the naive hope in many of her followers that she might in fact be a secret anti-Marketeer. The Premier has adroitly fuelled this hope by adopting a series of 'tough' poses in various rounds of negotiations she has had with European political heads over the terms of continued British participation in the EEC. All that this has done, however, is cause irritation to our Continental friends and neighbours, who, rightly enough, are impatient with someone who wants to be a member of their club but who is constantly showing dissatisfaction with the club's rules. It is a reasonable objection of theirs to say that if we do not like the rules then we should get out of the club – something which of course we should long ago have done. But whenever such a course has been suggested to Mrs. Thatcher she has rejected it outright. On that issue, as on so many others, she has shown herself, when it comes to the crunch, to be an obedient and willing tool of the internationalist liberal establishment which has dominated all British policy making for the past three decades.

DISASTROUS ECONOMIC RECORD

So far in this analysis of the Thatcher record I have omitted mention of her performance in the handling of the national economy, and it is now time to correct that omission. In fact the subject of the present Government's mismanagement of the economy is so vast, and the scope for condemnation so endless, that it merits a long article all to itself. Here I can only sketch very briefly over the issue.

In the economic field, as in so many others that have been the scene of action or inaction by the Prime Minister, mythology has been created in a profusion that shrouds fact. The leading myth is that of a strong national leader who is determined to persist with policies aimed at the long-term health of the economy notwithstanding that these policies cause much temporary unpopularity and notwithstanding the promptings of some of her weaker colleagues that she should abandon them.

Of course if the Thatcher prescription for economic revival was the wise and far-sighted one that it is claimed to be by her supporters, her determination to proceed with it, despite its temporary painful effects and unpopularity, would be entirely right, and she would be entitled to be credited with 'statesmanship', 'firm leadership' and all the other accolades she is receiving from those quarters. Were she in fact embarking on an economic course that was truly revolutionary and which represented a total departure from the weakness and muddle of previous decades, she would be deserving of the nation's gratitude and wholehearted support.

But in fact the Thatcher economic policy is none of these things. Any 'revolutionary' flavour that it has exists more in the coating than in the substance. It is merely a mixture of free-trading and hard money ideas that have been in vogue among liberal economists ever since Adam Smith wrote his *Wealth of Nations* in 1776.

The essence of the defence of the Thatcherites of their economic package amounts roughly to this: British industry for many years has been operating in a climate of state mollycoddling that has nurtured inefficiency, overmanning and low competitiveness; it must now be removed from that climate and placed in a hard and bracing one in which the capable survive and the weak go to the wall. This, in theory, will restore its competitiveness and nurse it back to health. If 3 million or more have to become unemployed in the meantime, that is a pity but it is the price we have to pay. If we are patient, all will come right in the long run.

This is in fact the language of the economic kindergarten. It is the talk of people who have learned to parrot certain economic phrases without really having any idea what they mean, and without ever having seriously studied the factors and forces which account for the economic

Contd. on next page

success of certain nations and the economic failures of others.

Firstly, the statement that British industry has declined into its present condition by reason of state mollycoddling is the most gross over-simplification. What is much nearer the truth is that many industries have first been reduced to a state of non-viability in consequence of a series of faulty economic policies and decisions by successive governments, Tory just as much as Labour, then when in this state of non-viability they have been kept afloat, not by a reversal of these policies or decisions, but by financial subsidies which simply postpone the moment of collapse but do not deal with the causes of collapse.

In fact there can be no industries in the world which have been as thoroughly mollycoddled by the state as the industries of Japan, all of which have been built up by heavy state support and with the aid of protective barriers against foreign competitors which have given them a virtual monopoly of their own home market. It is absolutely true that better labour relations and working attitudes have also contributed largely to this Japanese success, but those who have held out Japanese labour relations and working attitudes as examples for the British to follow seem to have given little thought as to how they have been achieved; they have in fact been achieved against a background of wholehearted concern by the Government for the welfare of industry and all its members, manifest in the way in which the financial forces of Japan have been firmly directed by the Government towards industrial investment, and the way in which the Japanese market has been protected as an almost exclusive preserve of the Japanese producer. This kind of paternal attitude makes for good industrial relations – in contrast to Britain, where British Steel was laying off thousands of workers while immense quantities of steel were flooding into the country from abroad.

MONETARIST FIASCO

The other catastrophic policy for which Mrs. Thatcher has been responsible in the economic field is 'Monetarism' – the brainchild of a Jewish financial quack living in the United States by the name of Milton Friedman. In the name of Monetarism, industry has been systematically starved of the financial investment it desperately needs to get on its feet and expand. This starvation has been defended by Mrs. Thatcher and her apologists on the grounds that, if new money was brought into being to fuel industrial development, this would involve a massive expansion of borrowing at interest, and that would create further inflation. Again the economic kindergarten is asserting itself. If the Government simply had the courage to print, debt-free, a vast issue of new money to finance industrial growth, then ensure by protective measures that the products of that growth could be sold in Britain, there could be a huge increase in the gross national wealth which would more than balance the monetary increase created to make it possible. That the Government declines to take this commonsense step we can put down to a mixture of stupidity and lack of grasp of real economics – combined with a revolting subservience to the mandarins of International Financial Power.

JUST ANOTHER POLITICIAN

I hope that in this article I have demonstrated that the lady now being heralded as some modern-day Joan of Arc, sent by heaven to lead the British people towards their national salvation, is in reality just another professional politician – a bit more energetic and forceful than the rest but basically out of the same political stable. That she has been able to rise to the top of the Tory Party, notwithstanding the disadvantage of her sex, is something that we could interpret two ways. On the one hand, it could indicate exceptional political talent and determination; on the other hand, it could be regarded as a pathetic reflection on the calibre of the male members of the party. Indeed when one beholds the present Cabinet on parade one is inclined to think Maggie the manliest of the lot. But whatever the talent and determination of the Tory leader, let us be clear about one thing: it is a talent and determination dedicated wholly to the furtherance of the political career of Margaret Thatcher – not to the welfare of the British Nation.

There is a strange parallel between the Thatcher phenomenon and that of President Reagan in America. Both came to power on a strong wave of 'right-wing' support. Both incorporate a certain drum-banging 'patriotism' in their style of rhetoric. Both are monsters in the eyes of the lunatic left. Both are practised in the art of acting – the one by virtue of a long background in that very profession, the other just by pure personal instinct. And both have been utter disasters for their respective countries.

In America, despite Reagan, and in Britain, despite Thatcher, nothing has really changed – except for the worse. In both countries the great institutions of national corruption remain intact because no real national revolutions have occurred whereby they may be divested of their power. Mere figureheads have been placed in office to provide the illusion of great change, while 'the system' continues as before. Thatcher – like Reagan – is a willing servant of that system. Don't expect her to be otherwise, for if she were she would not be there.

ANOTHER HORRIFIC BLACK MUGGING

HERE IS THE FACE of 73-year-old Lucy Giles as it looked after she had been set upon and savagely beaten up by two young Black thugs in Brixton last month.

The two Blacks only got away with £6 but it was not for the want of trying. Mrs. Giles was badly injured about the head and body and her face was a mass of bruises and cuts.

For once the Blacks got a sentence that will give them cause to regret their action – although it was less than we would have preferred to see them get. Victor Greenidge, 28, a Rastafarian, was jailed for 12 years and Alan Mendez, 19, received 6 years.

Lucy Giles (73) after the attack

The Holocaust that really DID happen

An American view of the Jewish rape of Lebanon

In recent years U.S. ambassadors to Afghanistan, Guatemala and Sudan have been murdered in cold blood. But America let these killings pass, without bombing the offending countries or exacting thousands of casualties as compensation. If such vengeance had been taken, not only would the world have screamed bloody murder, the loudest screams would have emanated from American Jews and their ventriloquist TV dummies. Only Israel, among all the nations in the world, is permitted Holocaust-level overkill.

Within 24 hours after Israel's ambassador to Britain, Shlomo Argov, was shot in the head in London, Israel's made-in-America warplanes were leveling large areas of many Lebanese cities and lobbing made-in-America cluster bombs on Lebanese villages and Palestinian refugee camps, while Israel's made-in-America tanks "retaliated" their way up from the south. (Israel never attacks, it merely retaliates after being provoked.) We will never get the exact casualty figures, but before the Israeli invasion ends, we may be sure that thousands of Arabs will have been killed (a preliminary estimate was 10,000), and tens of thousands will have been wounded and hundreds of thousands (a preliminary estimate 500,000) made homeless or made homeless again. All of which seems to be somewhat rougher than the eye-for-an-eye treatment recommended by the Old Testament and so often used by our mediacrats to put the best possible face on Zionist military terror. In Lebanon it has been a whole community, a whole village, even half a country, for an eye. As our Protestant and Catholic clerics primly forget to remind us, the eye-for-an-eyeism is being visited upon a people, at least 40% of whom are Christians.

PAID FOR BY U.S.

As has been its custom, the U.S. government puts up with this ghastly massacre, continues to subsidize the massacreurs, and even goes to some lengths to justify these recurring exercises in berserk racism. In a subtle sense we are told by our masters and mediators to think "positively" about the valorous record the Israeli armed forces are racking up in the annals of military history. The destroyers of refugee camps are hailed as mighty conquerors. When 60,000 troops armed with the most lethal instruments of modern war technology, preceded by 500 tanks and squadrons of the most advanced warplanes ever to take to the skies, storm into a country that hardly exists, the operation is written up in the "impact press" as a sort of rebirth of chivalry. Both *Time* and *Newsweek* came out with almost identical stories on the

Contd. on next page

This Lebanese woman lost 2 children in a Jewish raid

chief Israeli butcher, Ariel Sharon, comparing him to Patton, and almost identical covers -- pics of an Israeli tank -- and the identical caption, "Israeli Blitz." It was no coincidence. The writers hired by both news mags know the party line by heart. When the Arab states invade Israel, as they will someday, even if that day be very long in coming, *Time* and *Newsweek* will again have identical covers. But this time there will be no tanks; just carefully posed pictures of mutilated Israelis and long lines of Zionist refugees weeping their way along jam-packed roads of misery.

Navigating nimbly over the sea of blood in which Lebanon is drowning, Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick gets on "Meet the Press" and spends most of her time trying to avoid one word of criticism for her beloved Israel, at the very moment thousands of Lebanese and Palestinian women and children are biting the dust. Alexander Haig, his plastic mind on the 1984 presidential race, solemnly announces that we must all bear in mind that Israel has been shelled and rocketed by Palestinians, and then resigns, presumably because we are not doing enough to encourage an all-out Israeli assault on West Beirut. What matters that one more lie is piled on to the Himalayan range of lies? No PLO missile killed one single Israeli during the entire length of the latest 9-month cease-fire until Israel had launched a massive air raid on Beirut after the death of a minor Israeli diplomat in Paris. There was not an iota of proof that Palestinians had played any part in the Paris attack. As it turned out, the London assassination attempt was the work of an anti-PLO group. No Palestinian was among the arrested suspects.

When it was known that Israel was shipping Dagger fighter bombers to Argentina, neither Haig nor Zioness Kirkpatrick uttered a syllable of mild reproof. Indeed, the State Department let 30 tons of Israeli bombs and other arms fly on to Argentina from Kennedy Airport in a Ecuador jet transport which carried papers describing the cargo as "aircraft parts." Was not the U.S. supposed to be supporting Britain in the Falklands crisis? True, but when Israel enters the picture, all previous pronouncements and policies have to be altered or modified to fit the wishes of the Voice from Jerusalem. Neither did the gang of Israeli fellow travelers in Foggy Bottom dare to criticize Israel's arms sales to Iran, either now or back in the days when the Ayatullah was holding 50 American hostages.

MORE BLOOD MONEY

As the Mideast boiled, the U.S. Senate (which might better be called the U.S. Knesset) was proposing to reward the latest acts of Israeli barbarism with more blood money extracted from American taxpayers. By a vote of 12 to 0, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee incomprehensibly called for a reduction of the financial aid package to El Salvador by $100 million, while increasing the annual tribute to Israel by $425 million. What is even more incomprehensible, at the very moment Israeli guns were blasting Lebanon, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved a bill that in future years would assure that Israel would receive enough money

This little boy lost his left arm in an attack by Israeli butchers

to equal the principal and interest on whatever Israel owed the U.S. Nothing like a creditor forever loaning the debtor enough money to pay his debts and the interest on his debts! Even Senator Percy objected to this financial legerdemain. The Senate also did nothing about cancelling the sale of 75 F-16 fighter planes worth $2.5 billion that Israel has been allowed to "buy." But it did object mightily to 36 F-5s and some antiaircraft missiles which Jordan wanted to buy.

PLANNED IN ADVANCE

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon was on the books long before the assassination or attempted assassination of any Israeli diplomat. It was not by any means limited to the goal of moving Palestinians "25 miles north of the Israeli border." In regard to mileage, Israeli troops have gone as far as Beirut, which is about 60 miles north. And the 7,000-man U.N. peace-keeping force let them through without firing a shot!

As every newsman knows, but few told, the invasion was not just an attack against the PLO. It was an all-out strike against Syrian antiaircraft missiles. Somehow only a few of the missiles were fired before the Israelis destroyed them. Somehow the Syrians took a terrible drubbing, particularly in the air, and then almost immediately agreed to a cease-fire which left the Palestinians in the lurch. Israel's defeat of the Syrians was turned by the media into a great act of friendship and assistance to the United States. Now, we were told, the Pentagon would get its hands on Syria's Russian tanks. The superiority of American planes to Russian MiGs was proven. The media, however, did not emphasize

Contd. overleaf

THE HOLOCAUST THAT REALLY DID HAPPEN

(Contd. from prev. page)

that our F-15s and 16s were also superior in bombing and destroying Beirut apartment buildings full of Lebanese mothers and children. There is a law against allowing U.S. weapons to take part in such wanton destruction. But Israel, with the tacit agreement of our lawmakers, transcends all laws.

One Israeli propaganda ploy that got a big play in a press determined to excuse the inexcusable was that an Israeli victory would be a major blow against world terrorism. If that were truly the Zionist goal, then the best way to lower the rate of terrorism would be for the Israelis to turn their arms against themselves. In the last year or so, Israelis have been shooting down Palestinian children on the West Bank on a regular basis, have blown the legs off a couple of Arab mayors and shot down pious Moslems praying in the Dome of the Rock mosque, one of Islam's holiest shrines. In the old days murder in a cathedral or in a mosque was considered more serious than a murder committed elsewhere. Not anymore. The American-born Jew who killed two worshippers in the Jerusalem mosque has dropped out of sight and sound. A strange silence for a government which has a photographic 3,000-year memory for crimes allegedly committed against its own people.

If the Zionist "fumigation" of Lebanon is really going to put an end to Middle Eastern terror, then perhaps the British troops in Northern Ireland should take a leaf out of Begin's book. After all, the Ulsterites have suffered much more from IRA terror than Palestinian terror has cost the Israelis, both in number of lives lost and number of buildings bombed. Why shouldn't the British invade Ireland and do the same to the IRA as Israel is doing to the PLO? And why not in the process kill 10,000 or 20,000 innocent Irishmen and do a billion dollars worth of damage to Irish homes and factories? Would the White House regard such an operation with the same forgiving eye and tolerance with which it has viewed the Zionist scorched-earth steamroller in Lebanon?

Emboldened by their military victories over one of the world's most defenseless countries, the Israelis plan to set up a pro-Zionist Lebanese government. Although Lebanon has a Moslem majority, Israel feels more comfortable with a small anti-Moslem group of "Christian" mercenaries which wants to drive all the Palestinians who have survived the Israeli attack out of Lebanon. Where will the homeless go? Certainly they will not be allowed into the United States. The ADL will see to that.

Before and in the early days of World War II, Jewish press lords excoriated collaborators and "quislings" who headed Germany's so-called puppet states. But when Israel plans to set up a puppet state of its own by force of arms, we hear nothing about puppets, fifth columnists and fascist traitors. One reason is that the U.S. itself has become a puppet state of Israel.

The future? After Lebanon will come Jordan, where Israel is planning another puppet state, and after Jordan, Syria, and after Syria, Iraq, two Arab nations which Israel plans to decimate -- and so on and so forth until the Star of David flutters over the oilfields of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States. The Zionist dream is a Greater Israel, an Israeli empire with a Zionist military junta at the top, with the U.S. Treasury in its pocket and millions of toiling Arabs on the bottom to obey their overseers' every command. There are, however, a few catches. Within a few decades the Promised Land will contain many more Middle Eastern Jews (racially akin to the surrounding Arabs) and many fewer Eastern European Jews (the pioneers and racist fanatics that have made Israel's military victories possible). The decline of this Ashkenazi caste must eventually dilute the Zionist will to power.

And as the Israeli empire grows and gropes east and north, sooner or later it is going to run head-on into the Soviet Empire. What will happen then is *not* anybody's guess. The Russians will easily wipe out the Zionist armies, but in that event there will be great pressure, perhaps overwhelming pressure, to drag America into the conflict so that millions of American lives can be added to the billions of American dollars which have been keeping the state of Israel on its feet for the past 34 years.

To keep Israel quiet, Rome, in the time of the late republic and early empire, gave the Jews privileges extended to no other non-Romans. The appeasement never worked. The exasperated Roman legions under Titus put Jerusalem to the sword in A.D. 70, and Hadrian in A.D. 135 extinguished the flickering sparks of Jewish resistance. But not the very last spark. In 1948, after hibernating for more than 18 centuries, the Jewish state wriggled back into history. The old sore spot had returned, like a cancer in full bloom after a long period of remission. Will the old story repeat? Will the white world, as it did in the time of the Romans, be able to organize a spot-removal campaign? Even if it does, it will only solve part of the problem. Israel is not just in Israel. Israel is everywhere. How does one remove a spot as big as half the globe itself?

Meanwhile, Begin struts upon the world stage as a second Judah Maccabeus (or Attila the Hun). He arrives in his second capital, New York, to receive the frenzied plaudits of American Jewry while his American-supplied legions in Lebanon go merrily about their atrocities. It's surprising he didn't bring along a planeload of PLO prisoners and Lebanese grandfathers and lead them in chains in a triumphant procession up Fifth Avenue. If he had, we may be sure that Reagan, having had his European summit half-wrecked by Israel's warmongering, having been lied to repeatedly by Tel Aviv and generally humiliated as a spineless Israeli toady, would have been in the reviewing stand with a big fat smile on his face.

What a lousy administration! What a lousy country to put up with such an administration! *Illic heu miseri traducimur!*

Reprinted with acknowledgements to INSTAURATION, Box 76, Cape Canaveral, Fl. 32920, U.S.A.

Why we need a

NEW SOCIAL ORDER

by PHILIP BAKER

WHILE the titanic struggle on which British nationalists are currently embarked is primarily to ensure that political and economic survival of Britain as an independent nation-state, there is also a great deal of work to be done to bring about a change in our society before we can be said to deserve to survive at all. A thorough house-cleaning to remove the accumulation of spiritual and moral garbage that has grown up over more than half a century in the name of "progress", "equality" and "freedom" and which more than anything else has contributed to the decline of our nation.

How do you save a nation? Above all how do you save a nation from itself? How do you give it the will to live, to work? How do you restore its pride, its self respect, its courage, its sense of purpose?

Fifty years ago it was possible to find some if not all of these qualities in Britain. No more. We have lost our place in the world and with it our faith in ourselves, in our standards and in our traditions.

We are in decline as the Romans were and unless we look to ourselves we will die as surely as Rome died. Not because we have lost an empire, but because we have lost our heads.

The Romans are remembered for their roads. With luck we shall be remembered for the English language.

The decline of Rome was the result of a deep social and spiritual sickness. Drugs, promiscuous sex in all its forms, intermarriage with the subject races of Africa and Asia and a mad scramble for money and pleasure resulted in successive generations becoming progressively more soft and decadent.

To give themselves the peace to enjoy their permissive society, they surrendered bit by bit their imperial heritage. Until at last they were left with only the pleasure cities of their heartland — an example that Britain has been following increasingly over the last 40 years.

SYMPTOMS OF ROME DOWNFALL

All the factors that brought about the downfall of Rome are present in British society today — and in Western society generally. Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

Spengler called it the "Decline of the West". To Marxists it is the "eclipse of the capitalist society". And it is no coincidence that Marxists are to be found in the forefront of every movement that encourages national self-destruction.

The Establishment parties have no such base. They are shallow entities intent on power for its own sake. Their party aims go no deeper or no farther than winning the next election. They stagger from one crisis to the next, from one set of lies to the next. And the ambitions of their leading members are tuned only to the furtherance of their own careers inside and outside politics.

We have got to bring about a revolutionary change in existing institutions and values. We have got to offer people decent goals. Something more than just getting bigger pay packets for less work, bigger houses with TV and video in every room, double glazing and two cars in the garage.

We have got to restore standards. To restore national discipline and a belief in patriotism and national destiny. To eradicate the cancer of liberalism and internationalism from our domestic affairs. We have got to get rid of the notion that revolutionary changes can be brought about and a complex modern society can be run on a "voluntary" basis. And we cannot let sentiment or false sympathy stand in our way.

To ensure the survival of all that is best in our race, its moral purity and health, we have got to replace the depraved negro-based "pop" culture with a racially based Anglo-Saxon-Celtic culture. We have got to give people, especially young people, more worthwhile pastimes than pubs and discos and more worthwhile models for their lives than drug-soaked pop singers or the overpaid and overrated "superstars" of what passes for sport.

So our task goes far beyond bringing order and efficiency to the chaos of our present political and economic structure. We have in short to create a new society.

That is why our new party must not settle for being just another unit in the political spectrum — another group of ambitious people intent on climbing on the gravy train of power. A new party on the old model is not enough. Clearly, alternative policies are not enough. The rot has bitten too deeply into our whole social, political and industrial fabric. We have got to offer something more than just firm government. We must be a party, not only of political, but also of social regeneration. We must have, and be seen to have, a spiritual and moral as well as a political base.

NEW FAITH

Our politics in fact must be our whole attitude to life itself. Our leaders must be free from any taint of criminal or moral deviation. Our members must be responsible and disciplined, with an overriding sense of duty. For it is these individuals who are the apostles of the new faith and who will be the political, economic and spiritual leaders of the New Britain.

For only when we have cleaned out our Augean stables can we go on to the wider aims of restoring Great Britain as a world power in partnership with the other nations of the old White Commonwealth. But first the people have to be made physically and mentally fit for such a task.

There is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things. So we cannot say with certainty when or if we will succeed in our great mission. But history would condemn us for not trying.

'GAY LIB' DEMONSTRATION
An example of the degeneracy that brings about social collapse

BUILDING YOUR LOCAL BRANCH (No. 3)

The branch meeting

Whatever the scale and scope of branch activities of our party (and we will deal with these in a later section) no branch programme is complete without the holding of regular branch meetings.

Branch meetings provide the opportunity for local members to keep in personal contact with one another and exchange ideas. Most members will depend on regular attendance of these meetings for the maintenance of their interest. At the meetings future programmes for the promotion of the party can be discussed. Discussions can also be held to increase the political awareness of members. New recruits, or prospective ones, can be introduced to the party. Members can form a social circle and get to know friends of the same outlook, in the case of some people living alone relieving loneliness. Communications coming from the National Headquarters of the party can be passed on by the Organiser to the members. Party literature can be sold.

Every branch of the party in fact originates from a meeting of this kind. A small number of members may have been active in the area for some time in an informal way, in which capacity they would be designated as a **group.** This means an embryo unit of the party that has not yet satisfied the party leadership that it can be recognised as a **branch.**

The first step towards the granting of **branch status** to the unit is for all the interested persons in the area to be called together for a meeting. This may be done by an official of the region in which the unit is situated, or it may be done by a representative of National Party Headquarters. This official will act as Chairman of this initial meeting and he or she will instruct the members present as to their tasks. Finally, the official, after having made the acquaintance of these members, will appoint the officers of the unit. The official may seek the guidance of the members present as to which persons are preferred for these offices, but the final decision will lie with that official alone. There is no voting.

If the visiting official is then satisifed that the unit meets all the necessary requirements of a **branch** of the party, he or she will then recommend to National Headquarters that the unit be granted branch status. A certificate to this effect is given to the unit and requires to be renewed every year.

Thenceforward it is the task of the **Organiser** of the branch to convene regular branch meetings. That Organiser may also act as Chairman of these meetings or he or she may appoint another branch member to do that job. The Organiser, Chairman and all other officials of the branch must be **full members** of the party.

REGULARITY IMPORTANT

Normally branches are expected to hold meetings not less than **once monthly.** Some branches of the party go beyond this requirement and meet fortnightly and in a few cases even weekly. This is optional, but if meetings are more frequent than at monthly intervals they should not be too long and should preferably precede some other activity on the same evening. The unit must never get into the habit of so much **talking** that there is little time left for **action.**

In rare cases where the branch covers a very large area and the members are scattered and have to travel considerable distances to meetings, Headquarters may at its discretion agree to meetings being held at bi-monthly intervals. This, however, is not considered ideal.

Notification of branch meetings can be sent by post but a good method is to hold them at the same place at a fixed day of every month, such as the first Wednesday or the last Friday. In this way there can be a saving of postage on notifications, which only need be sent to newcomers who are not aware of the arrangement.

When the group or branch is in its early stages and possibly very small, the meetings may take place in one of the members' homes — if they are willing. This will save the cost of a hired room and will be a secure meeting place. Later, if the branch becomes much larger, it will probably be necessary to hire a special room or small hall at a fee. Many public houses have such premises, and they have the added incentive to accommodate us because our members will buy their drinks.

In arranging a branch meeting it is important to create 'atmosphere'. A national flag is always desirable, and if possible some recorded music — preferably of a national flavour — should be made available. This can be played before, between or after the agenda for the meeting.

MEETINGS MUST BE INTERESTING

It is vital to make branch meetings **interesting** and **enjoyable.** If they are not, you will not get the full complement of local members to attend them. The hard core activists will turn up out of a sense of duty but you will miss the others, who, if they do nothing else, can contribute money. The biggest possible meetings give the greatest encouragement to all in attendance, as well as being the most profitable.

On the agenda of a branch meeting certain items are essential and others optional. The essential items are:—

(a) Activities reports and discussion
(b) Treasurer's report
(c) Any important announcements from National Headquarters or from the Regional Organiser
(d) Collection for branch funds
(e) Distribution of latest party literature.

In the section of the agenda dealing with activities there should be a report on the activities of the past month, followed by a discussion of any lessons to be learned from these activities. Then there should be an announcement of any future activities. New ideas for activities which may promote the party should always be welcomed from the members present.

The Branch Treasurer, in making his or her report, should always have up-to-date figures of branch finances available should they be required, but it is not necessary at every meeting to read out a detailed statement of accounts, for this can be boring and time-wasting. What branch members will want to know is how the branch is progressing in building up its financial strength, and there can be a discussion of ways and means of doing this if the Organiser deems it useful.

Announcements from National Headquarters and the region are important. Because of the great expense, Headquarters and the region cannot send bulletins to all members more than a very few times every year. What it does do is send frequent bulletins to Branch Organisers, who in turn are expected to pass on to their members those items of news they ought to know. It is the same with regional announcements.

Collections at branch meetings are an absolutely vital procedure. These account for a very major part of branch funds, which are needed for the regular purchase of party literature and for other essential expenses, including often the paying for the room in which the meeting is being held. This is why it is valuable to get to come to meetings those members who are not normally present on branch activities. Often the members who are least able to take part in activities are those who have the best jobs and are the best paid. We have to appeal continually to their consciences to make up with financial contributions for what they do not contribute by active work for the branch.

Literature distribution is an important function of branch meetings. It is often a good idea to persuade those members who are better paid — and sometimes less active — to commit themselves to buying a regular quota of the periodicals supporting the party in

Contd. on next page

order to resell these or hand them out free to their friends. In this way the circulation of those periodicals can be built up. We will be saying more about literature sales in another section.

At every branch meeting there should be a table containing a literature display with a branch member detailed to take charge of it and attend to sales (one of the most attractive lady members of the branch is ideal for this purpose!). Some enterprising branches also display a few books on the literature table. It is a good idea to enquire into what are the best sellers among the titles turned out by the various Nationalist book publishers in Britain and in English-speaking countries elsewhere and to buy a selection of these for resale at meetings. Profits from these sales can greatly help branch funds as well as the books contributing to the political education of members.

TALKS

So far we have dealt with essential and routine items for branch meetings. Now we come to other items. By this we mean items which do not have to be included, as a rigid rule, on the agenda of every branch meeting but which ought to be featured fairly regularly in order to make the meetings interesting, educational and enjoyable.

One such item is a talk on some political subject followed by a discussion of that subject. Ideally, the talk should be given by a practised speaker but it is not always possible to obtain such a speaker with the frequency desired, and so on some occasions it is a good idea to give members a chance to try themselves out as speakers for the first time. The party constantly needs to develop more speakers – it never has enough of them. And the only way to expand our panel of speakers is for people to be prepared to 'have a go' from scratch, not minding if on the first one or two occasions their speeches appear amateurish. This is the only way that speakers can learn.

Obviously, the most interesting type of speech is one made by a highly experienced and accomplished speaker, and speakers of this calibre usually have to be obtained as guests – usually by application to National Headquarters. In this case their travelling expenses, and sometimes their accommodation, have to be paid for by the branch. This is why there is obviously a limit on the number of times such speakers can address branch meetings during the year.

As a substitute for a live speech, there is another medium: the recorded speech. The party has started to produce a series of cassettes, which can be played at branch meetings, and the range is continually being expanded. These cassette-recorded talks can also be followed by a discussion on the subject in question.

It may be that at some meetings no speaker is available, nor any recorded talk. In that case an interesting discussion can still take place. One idea is to take, on each such occasion, a point from the party's official statement of policy and encourage those at the meeting to give their views on the subject to which it refers. Another idea is to seize upon some very promiment current issue and invite a similar discussion on that. A third idea is to read a few short passages from an important book of interest to Nationalists and to invite discussion on the subject of those passages and how the message that they contain might be applied to our contemporary situation in this country.

In all such discussions one thing is important. Experience shows us that if people are left to themselves it is always a minority among them which does all the talking. To keep the interest of everyone alive, the Chairman of the discussion should 'draw out' the more reserved members present and invite them to contribute their opinions. Often those who are disposed to talk the least have something more intelligent to say than some of those who talk the most! The intelligent thinker but reluctant talker can find a new confidence after having for the first time said something in front of a gathering of people and found that they listen attentively. Out of this process many of the best potential leaders of the party are discovered.

What has been said so far about speeches and discussions assumes that they are about public issues. But there is also an important place for speeches and discussions on matters internal to the party, such as propaganda, organisation, and other aspects of party promotion. These too should feature regularly in the programme of branch meetings.

Another event well worth organising, although it probably cannot be done every month, is a film show. This is easiest if the branch has its own projector, but it is possible, if not, to arrange for a projectionist to come to the meeting as a guest – although in that case of course expenses will rise. Branches should contact Headquarters for advice and assistance on this matter.

There is one final event which should be incorporated into as many branch meetings as possible, most suitably at the end when the formal part of the meeting has been declared closed. This is an informal social period in which members can move around freely and drink and talk with one another. This is the time when a good musical background can add to the enjoyment, although it should never be too loud. The time available for this period will of course vary in accordance with the length of the formal agenda but it is a good thing, when possible, to leave at least half an hour for it before the end of the evening.

In the event of the meeting being at a member's home, drinks or coffee can of course be supplied but it is only fair that all present contribute to the cost of these and not leave it all to the host or hostess!

There is an important aspect of branch meetings that is often neglected. These meetings provide an excellent occasion to introduce new people to the branch and thus to the party. All members must in the course of their daily travels, at work and socially, come across people who express some sympathy with, or interest in, the Nationalist viewpoint. It is up to those members to stimulate this sympathy and interest, and one of the best ways to do this is to invite the persons in question to the next branch meeting as guests. Remember, branch meetings do not have to be restricted to members only, unless some particularly confidential or controversial party matters are going to be discussed, and this can be ascertained by a quick telephone call to the Organiser. Branch meetings should also be regarded as a means of inducting people who have made enquiries to the party but not yet joined. Often people will sympathise with our policies but be uncertain about what sort of people we are because they have read some particularly vicious piece of press propaganda written against us. To get them to come and meet the local members is a good way of breaking down this uncertainty.

There is one final thing that must be said. Branch meetings must be **orderly** and **disciplined** affairs. At them the Chairman's authority is absolute. Nobody speaks at the meetings except by the consent of that Chairman. The Chairman must develop the art of timing the agenda so that no part of it goes on for so long that there is not time for the remaining parts. This means that discussion must be limited. The Chairman should always be courteous but always be firm. He or she should not permit 'mini-meetings' to take place in corners of the room while the meeting proper is in progress, and anyone who, after repeated warnings, refuses to obey the rulings of the Chairman must be obliged to leave.

OUR DEGENERATE ARISTOCRACY

Here is a case which surely qualifies for the title of 'Degenerate of the Year'. Its name is Sir Richard Blake, scion of an old aristocratic family, who is seen here on the occasion of his wedding to Black jazz singer Bertice Reading. Asked how the title Lady Blake sounded to her, the bride replied: "Just fine Honey."

ARYANS

Alexander the Great (left), Hannibal (centre) and Caesar (right) show the type of aristocratic Aryan features that contrast strongly with those of the present inhabitants of the Mediterranean area

HOW CIVILISATIONS ROT THROUGH RACE DECAY

by OLIVER GILBERT

ARNOLD TOYNBEE in his *Study of History* writes of well known civilisations of the past that in the course of evolution have sprung up from small tribal beginnings to become major influences in the world, then due to man's interference with the laws of nature, have declined and faded out, such as the Sumerian, Babylonian, Assyrian and Chaldean civilisations in the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys. China's civilisations have been rhythmic in their rise and fall, and Mayas seem to have had one great period when they reached a grand climax, which unfortunately did not last long, and the conquering Spaniards put the finishing touches to their ultimate collapse.

The rhythmic nature of civilisations has always intrigued historians, especially the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire and the glories of Ancient Egypt. When we look at the inferior racial types in Southern Italy and the results of centuries of miscegenation in Egypt we clearly see the effects of interfering with nature's way of dealing with the evolutionary process – the survival of the fittest. The high standards of these two ancient civilisations were rotted from within by the effects of the Aryan ruling classes having their blood streams contaminated by the slaves brought in from the surrounding tribes they had conquered, who were forced to do the hard work they had grown too lazy to do themselves.

ROT OF EGYPT

Egypt especially was rotted from within by the large number of Nubian slaves it imported, whom it also trained as soldiers, hence eventually the emergence of a black Pharaoh. Then it slowly faded out, as Gibbons described in his *The Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*, due to the utilisation of slave labour from Asia Minor and Syria. Tenny Frank attributes the cause of Rome's decline to faulty judgement and diminishing intelligence and says: "Tangible causes include excessive taxation, debasement of the coinage, slavery, unemployment among skilled workers and the inevitable exhaustion of the soil," then he adds:–

> "The economic factors to be discussed when considering the decline of the Roman Empire, while numerous, do not seem to be the most vital ones. Most of them may be defined as symptoms of a general decay in the intelligence and vitality of the people then in possession of the government and its policies. If from these many causes of Rome's decline we must select the more potent ones, we should be inclined to name first Rome's rapid and ill-considered expansion, the existence of slavery on a vast scale and, as an immediate consequence of these two, **the thoroughgoing displacement of Romans by non Romans.** Augustus lectured the patricians in the Forum – in passionate, even violent language he verbally lashed them, saying: 'While

Contd. on next page

the government liberated slaves for the sole purpose of keeping up the number of citizens, the children of the Marcii, of the Fabii, of the Valerii and the Julii, allowed their names to perish from the earth.' But Augustus was wasting words. The ruling classes still abstained from having children. G. M. McCleary, in the Hibbert Journal (April 1947) stated '(As) bourgeoisie and nouveau riche strove to emulate their betters in Rome, their families died out.' "

Just after the war I spent many enjoyable weekends at the country home of George Pitt-Rivers, the well known anthropologist, from whom I gathered most of my knowledge of races. He told me that in his opinion and many other scholars another cause of the fall of Rome, and perhaps also Greece, was the patrician and aristocratic method of cooking wine, grape syrup and acid foods in leaden or lead-plated cooking utensils and the storage of liquids in lead-glazed pottery, which caused sterility, miscarriage, stillbirth, heavy child mortality and permanent mental effects on children.

Lead in those times was easily produced and quickly formed in cooking utensils. Its price meant that the poor used vessels that contained little lead, and this resulted in a high rate of damage to the upper classes, the bearers of culture, and the preservation of the lower orders, who had very little lead poisoning. It meant that the cream of each generation was brought to the top and skimmed off. No wonder Rome collapsed. This lead poisoning syndrome is very prevalent today in spite of the lessons of the past. Irving M. Shapiro in the Journal of the American Dental Association writes that he and his co-workers tested six brands of toothpaste. All contained lead, with a larger proportion in tubes that were nearly empty. He estimated that if a child brushes his teeth twice a day he gets 1,800 parts per million of lead each day from toothpaste, in addition to 130 ppm. from food. Lead, like the other poison sodium fluoride, added by some water authorities to water supplies, does not pass through the body but accumulates in the bones, as has been proved by several leading scientists. The adding of lead to petrol is another great danger to people on the roads of the world. Children are the chief sufferers. It is time that legislation was brought in to stop this extremely harmful practice by the immensely powerful petrol combines, whose power is so great that they can form or ruin states.

GENETIC IMPOVERISHMENT

Dr. Robert Gayre in *Mankind Quarterly*, wrote in the autumn number 1972 a brief article entitled "The Rise and Fall of Nations: Genetic impoverishment." Here is an excerpt:

"Despite the fact that all scientists concerned with biology have ineluctably been forced to accept the implication of genetics, we find that these laws have had little effect on the large body of . . . sociologists, social anthropologists, political thinkers and philosophers, very many psychiatrists and practically all politicians . . .

"It is therefore not surprising that the decline of nations is attributed to environmental causes . . . Or, putting the matter another way, the result of immigration, emigration, war, taxation and other social forces are not seen at all in their genetic setting . . ."

LORD BEVERIDGE
His Welfare State has encouraged the breeding of the lowest

Dr. Gayre uses his thesis to explain the collapse of the British Empire:—

"Eleanor Rathbone, a well known liberal MP, brought in an Act for family allowances, as a consequence of which, just at the very time when middle and upper classes had to restrict their birth rates, the least endowed elements (genetically) of the population were encouraged to expand theirs. Following this came Lord Beveridge and his welfare state which has, as a consequence, continued and developed the trend further."

Ernest A. Hooton, another well known anthropologist, wrote in *The Twilight of Man:*

"Material prosperity encourages the preservation, pampering and reproduction of the biologically inferior elements which are parasitical upon rich civilisations. Then some . . . culturally crude stock crashes in and wipes clean the slate . . . We can either prune off our own rotten stock or submit to a ruthless thinning out by more vigorous conquering stocks."

DELUSION

The main delusion fostered by the United Nations, the World Council of Churches and the Soviet Empire is the plausible hypothesis propounded by Lamarck that physical and mental qualities acquired in one generation could in some way be transmitted to the next generation, in other words that after a few generations of the requisite indoctrination and education (environmental influences) children would be born endowed with Communist or Christian dispositions and propensities. Marxist teachers who are instilling false ideas of racial equality and a feeling of guilt into our children about our colonial past and leaders of the Christian (?) religions and social workers who spread disruption find favour with their masters in the Kremlin by claiming they have verified its validity. But the world's leading thinkers and anthropologists like Dr. Gayre, Professor Eysenck, Arthur Jenson, George Pitt-Rivers and many others too numerous to mention have proved beyond doubt that the Lamarckian theory is utterly false and without any logical foundation.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):—

British Isles: £6.15 ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail: £6.60 ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail: £8.55 ☐

Unsealed air-mail Middle East: £9.50 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Canada, U.S.A., South America and Africa: £11.10 ☐ Unsealed air-mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £12.00 ☐

Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling; if remittance is in overseas currency an additional charge of £2 applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:—

10-19 copies: 28p ea.; 20-49 copies: 25p ea.; 50-99 copies: 21p ea.; 100-199 copies: 18p ea.; 200-499 copies: 15p ea.; 500 copies or over: 14p ea. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: Seacroft, Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.



Letters

SIR: There are a great many unanswered questions as to why we suddenly valued the Falkland Islands, which are 8,000 miles away and which we have neglected for so long.

There was natural anger aroused by their seizure, and we were told that our right and duty was to protect this territory. It was understood to be a matter of principle that we should rush to the aid of the Falklanders in their time of trouble.

But does a matter of principle really explain our actions or are there more subtle motives connected with international finance? After all, there are rich resources in the Falklands area such as fish, oil, uranium and other valuable minerals that are coveted by the greedy controllers of the multi-national companies and by the Soviets.

It is rather strange that the phrase 'kith and kin' has been bandied about as an excuse for our concern for the 1,800 Falklanders. Our 'kith and kin' did not matter one jot in Rhodesia (where there were nearly a quarter of a million of them); in fact even to refer to the Rhodesians as 'kith and kin' was considered to be wicked 'racialism'.

It is interesting to note that Margaret Thatcher referred to the Falklanders in Parliament on the 6th of May as "our own British people", and again on the 20th May she said that the presence of the Argentines in the Falkland Islands "would change the nature of society there." Might these things not be said of the White Rhodesians and of the switchover in their country to Black rule?

It appears now that the Falklanders, while British in the eyes of the Prime Minister, are not eligible to settle in this country, as under the British Nationality Act they are not British citizens.

Nearer home, in such places as Brixton, Notting Hill, Southall, Toxteth (Liverpool) and Moss Side (Manchester) many thousands of our kith and kin who are British citizens have been deprived of their homes and had an alien culture forced upon them, but our rulers, who are living comfortably outside these zones, care nothing for their own 'kith and kin' who are condemned to live in them. Have we not got our principles rather mixed up?

The plain truth is that our rulers have never been interested in protecting their own 'kith and kin' either in this country or abroad.

SUE EVELYN
Hove, Sussex

SIR: I am an 18-year-old Afrikaner who joined the short-lived South African National Front in January 1979. Since then I observed the activities of the British NF and during this peiod an image of your leadership qualities has been formed by me, which has been confirmed by your conduct during and after the turmoil in the NF.

It takes true grit for someone to part company with a movement in which more than a decade of his life lies, a movement to whose cause absolute sacrifice and dedication were given. It is indeed painful to see such a movement moving onto a course which could only mean the weakening of the solid principles on which it was built and the degradation of the high ideals which formally inspired its course.

It is a rare type of person who, rather than accept the situation for the sake of peace and comfort, chooses to break out for the sake of honour and principle, even if it might mean personal lonliness and political ruin.

But then the heroes of a nation always arise from struggle. A nation's heroes never come from the ranks of those who make excuses, those who whimper, those who coax and those who yield. And Nationalism does not tolerate the spineless and the double-tongued. Who wants to be its true exponent must walk straight, must talk straight and must be prepared to accept the enmity of friend or foe.

You demonstrate the notion above, showing to the world that the creed to which the Nationalist adheres makes the sort of man who will go through the fire or the mire, undaunted by the one, undefiled by the other.

The path of the true Nationalist leader is a hard, steep and lonely path. A nation that still produces the individual who is strong enough to choose this path and walk it to the end is a nation with a future.

The struggle between the different factions of British Nationalism drives this Nationalism through the crucible. In the heat purification will occur. In the cautery the hard nucleus will be burned harder still. In the pain the bonds of love for and dedication to the Nationalist cause will be forged stronger than ever.

The hard nucleus of Nationalist activists will find a political home in your party. Your leadership role is effectively embodied in its Constitution. Your clear vision about the correct political strategy for the 1980s has been shown in several article in Spearhead. If all these factors are taken into consideration against the background of what I have written above, your party will succeed where the old NF failed.

My sincere best wishes for the struggle in the years to come. May you lead British Nationalism to power in order to fulfil the noble ideals it maintains.

H. MATTHEE
Stellenbosch, South Africa

SIR: David Ball in his articles on the fallacies of Democracy (July issue) describes Tony Benn as being born to a noble family. Surely not. His Father, William Wedgwood Benn, worked in the family publishing business for several years before going into politics, first as a Liberal then on behalf of Labour. He was created first Viscount Stansgate in January 1942 in order to strengthen Labour representation in the House of Lords.

I also have the impression of having read somewhere that the family was originally of East European stock and that the name Wedgwood was adopted. Would this be correct?

G.E. DAWSON
Rhyl, Clwyd

SIR: It is not very often that I disagree with the opinions expressed in 'What We Think' but I was horrified to read of the suggestion for the abandonment of English, Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish football teams. 'English' is described in my dictionary as a people who occupy part of the Southern half of Britain and are descended from the Germanic peoples.

With the present establishment in power anyone can be 'British' but, according to the definition given above, it is an impossibility for a Black man to be English. I would imagine the same is true of the Scots, Irish and Welsh, although I have not checked it. For heaven's sake don't encourage the busybodies to interfere with our national identities anymore than they already have.

Perhaps in years to come when a truly patriotic Nationalist government is in power we can look at the situation again but please do not mention it for the next 20 years or so. Already up here in Leicester two Englishmen and one Scot have threatened never to speak to me again. Talk about guilt by association!

RAY HILL
Leicester

(Editor's note: It was not our intention to propose the complete abandonment of English, Scottish, etc. teams)

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY

A step towards unity (by JOHN WOOD)

APRIL 1982 witnessed the creation of a new nationalist movement: The British National Party. Led by John Tyndall, it has received support from people right across the nationalist scene including many members of the League of St. George.

The League of St. George is not, and has never intended to be, a political party. The League is simply a group of invited members who share a common bond of nationalist thought and patriotic dedication.

Whilst I am always mindful of the oath of allegiance to the League which every full member makes upon his induction, I am also aware of the function of the League to advise and assist other nationalist groups and to encourage a spirit of unity among them.

In recent years, however, many of these groups have inherited the sickness of the old parties, the decay and stagnation of creed and duty, a lack of pride and purpose. The National Front, divided and split again and again from within its own ranks. Personality clashes, petty bickering leading to virtual wholesale war and the lust for power, prestige and position have taken their toll of what once was a great party worthy of putting up a serious challenge to the decaying democratic system.

British Movement at its height was well on its way to being big enough and strong enough to overtake the declining NF. It could have replaced the Front as the premier nationalist party. Again, we have seen the BM virtually decimated and destroyed, and although the circumstances of its decline were different, the same sickness was responsible. Mistrust, jealousy and greed were the victors.

A great many branch organisers and rank-and-file members of these parties are absolutely sick and fed up to the back teeth of seeing years and years of hard work and struggle go down the drain in order that a chosen few at the top of the tree can carve their parties up every which way they choose.

THE WAY FORWARD

To any serious student of nationalist politics, it is manifestly obvious that only one man has emerged from this sorry mess with some credibility. John Tyndall resigned from the NF to form another party, the New National Front, and while some critics say that he should have stayed and fought from within the NF, I personally believe that the course he took was the only one open to him.

Within a very short time of its formation, the New National Front grew to a very respectable size. Many former members of both the old NF and BM who thought that they had been betrayed by their leaders swelled the ranks of this new party. Branches were formed up and down the country, enthusiasm grew and the spirit of nationalism flourished. The day of the NNF had arrived, a breath of fresh air on the nationalist scene!

It became increasingly obvious, however, that the time for a change of name was essential. Many members felt that the name 'New National Front' suggested a 'Second Division Front' or a 'Not Quite The National Front'.

It was decided, therefore, to try to bring together, once and for all, a truly united party dedicated to settling petty differences and burying the hatchet with members of other parties who were still a little reluctant to give their support after having seen years of turmoil and disorder, and secondly to uniting under one banner, the vast majority of loyal nationalists.

The meeting in Charing Cross in March promised exactly that very thing. Leaders and senior members of all the nationalist parties were invited to participate. Many came – some did not. But the outcome of that meeting was a determination to succeed and a willingness to work together for the common good. The outcome was all that, and more, it was the birth of the British National Party!

I was present at that meeting and, as a League member, mindful of my duty towards nationalist unity and knowing that a great majority of League members were in agreement (including a 100 percent backing from my own area, the North of England), I did not hesitate in pledging my support for this new venture.

I said at the meeting that the British National Party, if it were to succeed, must be a party of revolution, dedicated to the service of Race and Nation, and that we must never again be hampered by the trappings of any pseudo-democratic policies. The BNP *must* be a party of leadership and strength. We must never offer watered down propaganda in order to attract mass membership. We must never shirk from our duty to cause and creed. We must never moderate, for moderation is liberalism and liberalism is stagnation and defeat.

If by my actions I have alienated any of my fellow League members then it is unfortunate, but I make no apology for my supporting the BNP. I sincerely believe that I have acted in the very best interests of nationalist unity.

TO BE STRONG AND RESOLUTE

The British National Party gives us on the nationalist scene one last chance of unity. It was tried before in 1967 with the creation of the National Front – it failed. This time we must not fail. We have too many enemies already; the Marxists and the financiers, the pinko-liberals and the culture-destroyers, who would see us defeated. Let us not add to our enemies by fighting amongst ourselves. We must be above the struggles of the common herd, we must be strong and always possess the spirit of the true nationalist revolutionary. Not for us the backstabbing and in-fighting of the old parties. Not for us the sickness and decay of the internationally financed corrupt democratic system.

The British National Party must be resolute in leadership; it must not hide behind the cowardice of the committee system, where no one is responsible, and the blame for failure can be shifted from hither to yon. The old parties love to hide behind each other in this way in order to evade the direct question and to distort the truth by endless discussion and debate. We will have none of it!

This new movement must be strong, and strength only comes from unity and trust, from loyalty and national comradeship and working as one for our cause. The character of the British Nationalist must be one of devotion to duty and pride in our country. In the BNP these qualities will be reborn, for if we fail, then the dark alien forces will be upon us and will seek out and destroy us all.

Yesterday's words from a great patriot and leader of men, a man I was proud and honoured to call Friend, were never more apt than at this moment.

"Together in Britain we have lit a flame that the ages shall not extinguish. Guard that sacred flame until it illuminates our land and lights again the path of mankind."

Oswald Mosley

KEEP THIS DATE FREE!

INDOOR RALLY

Organised by the BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY

Central London, Sat., October 16, in the afternoon

Details of location will be given next month

Read NEW FRONTIER
Voice of British Nationalism

You can obtain single copies of *New Frontier* by paying a subscription of £3.40 for 12 issues (for subscribers in the British Isles). For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail).

If you wish to obtain *New Frontier* in bulk for redistribution, the rates are:—

10 copies £1.20 + 32p post
25 copies £2.70 + 94p post
50 copies £4.80 + £1.57 post
100 copies £8.40 + £1.90 post
150 copies £11.70 + £2.10 post
200 copies £14.40 + £2.25 post
300 copies £19.80 + £2.55 post
400 copies £24.00 + £2.80 post
500 copies £29.40) Bulk rates
1,000 copies £55.20) by roadline

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *New Frontier*, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB. Please keep orders and enquiries for *New Frontier* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

Tapes for your library

BNP Recordings offer two cassettes dealing with Nationalist topics:—

VOICES OF NATIONALISM

Side 1: 'Whites unite!' – Excerpts from speeches at Nationalist rally in London on September 5th 1981 calling for Nationalist unity.

Side 2: 'The coming British Revolution' – Talk by John Tyndall on the fraudulence of 'liberal democracy' and the need for a radically new political system in Britain.

TYNDALL SPEAKS

Side 1: 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage' – John Tyndall talks about the great worldwide heritage of the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic peoples and calls for their unity.

Side 2: 'Britain's economic crisis' – John Tyndall talks about the breakdown of the British economy over a long period and calls for a new economic policy based on Economic Nationalism.

The cassettes cost £3 each – plus 16½p for postage. All orders should be sent to: BNP Recordings, Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

Party growth

The last month has been a very encouraging one for the growth of the British National Party, with a number of new active groups formed and the promise of more on the way.

At a meeting in **Birmingham** at the beginning of this month attended by party Leader John Tyndall and National Organiser Charles Parker the foundations of a proper branch were laid. The Birmingham party unit had previously revolved almost solely around Mr. Keith Axon, who had put in much hard work but with scarcely any support. At the meeting a number of newcomers came forward to help Mr. Axon and a programme of regular activities and meetings was set up.

From our Yorkshire and Humberside Region comes the news of the formation of a new active group in **York**, with Peter Poole the acting Organiser.

Now at long last the party has a proper active unit in **Manchester**, following a meeting in the city on the 3rd August. This has been made possible by the defection to the BNP on the part of a number of members of other nationalist organisations tired of those organisations' obstruction of nationalist unity. The acting Organiser of Manchester group is Gordon Gee.

In the West London suburb of **Ealing** several new members have recently joined, and now a proper active group is at last possible, whereas previously party stalwart Jock Shaw acted as sole party representative in the area.

In **Southend** a local group has been set up following the joining of the party by some ex-members of British Movement. These will assist established stalwarts Malvern Tipping and Brian Callow in the extension of activities.

In **Brighton** a small active group has also been formed following meetings between Charles Parker and a number of young local activists who have crossed over from the National Front. The group is now regularly leafletting and distributing party papers.

In addition to these developments, there is also now promise of an expansion of the party in Worthing (Sussex), Edinburgh, West Wales and North Devon. We hope to have further news from these areas next month.

BOOKS OF OPPOSITION. Send SAE for list of rare and out-of-print nationalist books. Advertiser, c/o Devlon, Ilsington, Newton Abbot, Devon

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

founded by

A. K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co. Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

MERSEYSIDE BECOMING MAJOR B.N.P. GROWTH AREA

THE MERSEYSIDE AREA has now become one of the major growth areas for the British National Party.

Over the past few months the branch has greatly expanded in membership and activities, and these activities have extended to giving a helping hand to units in other areas of North West England.

Now the Liverpool branch has brought out its own local newsletter, Liverpool Patriot, which reports local activities and comments on topical issues.

Merseyside will be known to all our readers as a part of the country which typifies the decaying liberal-democratic system more perhaps than any other. Unemployment is at one of the highest levels in the United Kingdom. Race riots have ravaged certain inner city districts and law and order are at an extremely low ebb.

Merseysiders should be better able than most to recognise the need for radical change in British politics, and the signs are that many of them are coming to do so.

In the earlier days of the Liverpool branch the Organiser was Steven Farrell, to whom the party owes a big debt for his work in building up the branch. Steve later had to withdraw from his Organiser's position in order to concentrate more time on his business, and his position was taken by Joe Owens, one of the party's most promising younger leaders, who has carried on the excellent work.

The branch also has reason to be thankful to former Regional Organiser John Green, who put in a great deal of work to assist the development of the party in the area.

When numerous nationalist groups amalgamated to form the BNP last April Merseyside was one of the areas where this amalgamation took powerful effect. Great numbers of nationalists who had previously been working for separate organisations came together under the BNP umbrella and have since worked as one.

Recently Joe Owens took a group from Merseyside over to Manchester for a day's activities and literature sales in order to boost the yet infant Manchester group. As a result of this action a considerable boost has been given to the party in Manchester, and the group has now been formally organised under the leadership of Gordon Gee.

The Liverpool branch, as befits all properly organised branches of the party, has now acquired a local address which interested people can contact. This is: PO Box 72, Liverpool L69 8AJ. We hope that readers in the area who want to help in activities will get in touch with the branch at this address.

BNP badge

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY is giving top priority to the production of a party badge. To this purpose a number of suggestions for designs have been received. The party wants, however, to obtain as many ideas as possible before any final decision is made. We are therefore running a competition to see which party supporter can submit the best design.

All entries should be sent to P. O. Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB and should arrive before the end of this month (September). It must, however, be stressed that there is no certain guarantee that the best design received will be adopted as the party badge. We will at any rate give recognition to the artist responsible.

Highly recommended TRADITIONAL BRITISH folk music LP, 'Cotswold Music' - Green Willow Band. Thoroughly entertaining album. £4. 85 (U.K.) including postage - from: Music Society, 28 Cheviot Close, Quedgeley, Gloucester.

YOUNG NATIONALIST

Read *Young Nationalist* the paper for youth published on behalf of the Youth Section of the British National Party. Send 20p for sample copy to: 16 Vale Lodge, Perry Vale, London S.E.23.

LEAGUE REVIEW

For a new view on human affairs read *League Review,* journal of the League of St. George. This is a 24-page pictorial magazine costing 45p. Subscription rate is £5 for 8 issues (British Isles). For sample send 60p to: *League Review,* 9/11 Kensington High Street, London W8 5NP.

Our magazine, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.

SPEARHEAD FUND

Spearhead, in this difficult period for British Nationalism, has only been kept alive by the loyalty of its most steadfast readers and by the generosity of particular supporters who have made sacrifices from out of their own pockets to help us continue in print.

Many former readers have felt unable to renew their subscriptions because of unemployment and the consequent need for financial economies. We have also had to sustain considerable losses in bulk sales as a result of the present division among British Nationalist groups.

These factors have made us all the more dependent upon the donations we can obtain from our small circle of committed loyalists. We can only ask that those in this circle maintain their contributions in the coming months and that others who have not previously donated beyond paying the bare price of their copies now try to do so. This is essential if we are to continue in publication.

We remind all those making financial donations that it is not our custom to send receipts automatically except for sums of £10 or over. This is in order to save the time of our office staff and economise on postage. If, however, any donor of less than £10 should desire confirmation that their donation has been received, would they please enclose an S.A.E. with the donation.

All contributions should be sent to *Spearhead,* 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.

Charlie at it again

PRINCE FIXES TRIP BY BRIXTON BLACKS (PICTURED BELOW) TO RED THUG MUGABE

Prince Charles

OUR JOURNAL supports the institution of Monarchy in Britain. For this reason it would ordinarily be our custom to speak with respect of members of the Royal Family.

Regretfully, we find that we cannot often do so these days when reporting the comings and goings of Prince Charles, Prince of Wales and Heir to The Throne.

For His Royal Highness The Prince quite evidently is out to win for himself a reputation for being a champion of multi-racialism, internationalism and every other kind of 'liberal' cause.

The latest of his antics in this respect is his support for a scheme to give 13 school pupils from Brixton (mainly Black) an 'educational' holiday in 'Zimbabwe' (formerly Rhodesia).

The idea was dreamt up by some silly, trendy little schoolmistress, Mrs. Maureen Aldred, who thought it would be a good stunt to send the children to this Black-ruled Communist country "for a lesson in race relations."

An expensive lesson, mark you — the cost of the trip came to £12,000.

After Mrs. Aldred had appealed without very much success to a number of charities to help her raise that sum, she tried writing to Prince Charles.

The response was immediate — when it comes to promoting projects of this sort HRH does not let the grass grow under his feet. He used his influence to bring in contributions and even visited the school for the purpose. In no time the money was raised. And, as if this was not enough, Prince Charles arranged for the children to be given a special talk on economics and history by the Prime Minister of 'Zimbabwe', Robert Mugabe, self-confessed Marxist and recent ex-terrorist!

Mugabe

We have to say it — at the risk of offending some of the stauncher royalists among our readers — Prince Charles' publicity-seeking campaigns on behalf of the Black community in Britain are becoming increasingly revolting to behold and are fast undermining the prestige and dignity of the institution he represents. Is there no-one in Royalty prepared to stop his foolish capers?

Find out about the British National Party

Send 20p for information pack.

To:
P.O. BOX 115
HOVE
E. SUSSEX BN3 3SB
(Tel. 0273 777540)

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

I enclose.....

Printed and published by Albion Press, Hove